UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                   | FILING DATE                        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/813,872                        | 03/30/2004                         | Dominique Charmot    | RLY 04031.102       | 5573             |
|                                   | 7590 06/26/200<br>OWERS LLP (ILPS) | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| 100 NORTH B                       | , , , ,                            | YOUNG, MICAH PAUL    |                     |                  |
| 17TH FLOOR<br>ST. LOUIS, MO 63102 |                                    |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                                   |                                    |                      | 1618                |                  |
|                                   |                                    |                      |                     |                  |
|                                   |                                    |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE   | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                                   |                                    |                      | 06/26/2009          | ELECTRONIC       |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s)   |  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| 10/813,872      | CHARMOT ET AL. |  |
|                 |                |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit       |  |

|   | MICAH-PAUL YOUNG  | 1618  |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | correspondence add  | ress                                      |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>05 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APF   | PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A  | LLOWANCE.   |   |
| 1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Comperiods:  | replies: (1) an amendment, affidaviteal (with appeal fee) in compliance   | t, or other evidence, v<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; o           | which places the r (3) a Request          |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date   | of the final rejection.   |   |   |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(  | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth a<br>ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE  | g date of the final rejection                             | on.                                       |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing data | of the fee. The appropri-<br>nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee<br>be action; or (2) as |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br/>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w<br/>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>   | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to   | avoid dismissal of the                                    |   |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,   | but prior to the date of filing a brief   | will not be entered be                                    | rcause                                    |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further co   |   |   | cause                                     |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo   |   | . — , ,   |   |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet   | ter form for appeal by materially rec   | ducing or simplifying t                                   | he issues for                             |
| appeal; and/or  |   |   |   |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a  |   | ected claims.   |   |
| NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  |   | !:  | DTOL 204)                                 |
| <ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li> </ol>  |   | mpliant Amendment (                                       | PTOL-324).                                |
|   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   | imaly filed emendmen                                      | at concoling the                          |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al<br/>non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>  | lowable ii submilled in a separale, i   | imely filed amendmen                                      | it canceling the                          |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:   |   | l be entered and an e                                     | xplanation of                             |
| Claim(s) bliected to:   |   |   |   |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,10,17,22-24,31,32,45-56,58-65 and 6</u>   | <u>57-69</u> .  |   |   |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |   |   |   |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                     |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>  | d sufficient reasons why the affidavi   | t or other evidence is                                    | necessary and                             |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>  | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea  | ıl and/or appellant fail                                  | s to provide a                            |
| 10. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio   | n of the status of the claims after er  | ntry is below or attach                                   | ed.                                       |
| REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been consideration because:  See Continuation Sheet.   | ered but does NOT place the applic  | ation in condition for                                    | allowance                                 |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s).  | (PTO/SR/08) Paper No(s)   |   |   |
| 13. Other:  | ( 5/55/55) i apoi 140(5).   |   |   |
| <u> </u>  |   |   |   |
| /Michael G. Hartley/<br>Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1618  | /MICAH-PAUL YOUNG<br>Examiner, Art Unit 1618  | 6/  |   |
|   |   |   |   |

Application No.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims continue to not meet the written description requirement. Further the claims do not differentiate over the Notenbomber particles since the patent disclose ion binding formulation where the particles are coated with synthetic polymers identical to the instant claims (styrene, vinyl, ethylene polymers). For these reasons the claims remain rejected.